

1  
2  
3  
4 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

5  
6 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

7  
8 CHONG SOOK LIM,

Case No. 1:20-cv-01049-NONE-SKO

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR  
KOREAN INTERPRETER

11 JENNIFER MENNE and MELANIE  
12 HUERTA,

(Doc. 20)

13 Defendants.

14 /

15 Plaintiff Chong Sook Lim is proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights  
16 action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (“Section 1983”). On May 25, 2021, Plaintiff filed a  
17 request for the Court to provide a Korean language interpreter for the scheduling conference on June  
18 17, 2021, and for “all other conferences and trials for this case in the future.” (Doc. 20.)

19 In criminal proceedings or in civil cases initiated by the United States, the Court must  
20 provide an interpreter for a non-English-speaking party. 28 U.S.C. § 1827(j). However, the present  
21 action is not a criminal prosecution, nor is it a civil lawsuit initiated by the United States of America.  
22 Rather, it is a civil action initiated by Plaintiff herself. Therefore, there is no statutory obligation to  
23 provide Plaintiff with an interpreter. *See Equal Employment Opportunity Commission v. Beauty*  
24 *Enterprises, Inc.*, 2002 WL 1626163 at \*3(D. Conn. May 21, 2002)(“Court Interpreters Act applies  
25 to civil proceedings initiated by the United States.”). Accordingly, Plaintiff’s request is DENIED.

26 Should Plaintiff wish to have an interpreter present at the upcoming scheduling conference  
27 (or any other court proceeding), she must make those arrangements. Information regarding locating

28 a qualified interpreter can be found here:

1 <http://www.caed.uscourts.gov/caednew/index.cfm/attorney-info/attorney-resources/court->  
2 [interpreters/](#) (“Find an Interpreter”).

3  
4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated: June 1, 2021

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28